UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/810,964	03/26/2004	Jayanta Kumar Dey	99-851CON1	9817

25537 7590 11/26/2008

VERIZON
PATENT MANAGEMENT GROUP
1320 North Court House Road
9th Floor
ARLINGTON, VA 22201-2909

EXAMINER	
NGUYEN, CHAU T	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/26/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patents@verizon.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/810,964	DEY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	CHAU NGUYEN	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *15 September 2008*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-10,12-23 and 25-37* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-10, 12-23 and 25-37* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 09/15/2008 has been entered. Claims 1-10, 12-23 and 25-37 are pending.

Double Patenting

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 1-10, 12-23 and 25-37 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-40 of U.S. Patent No. 6,996,775, claims 1-24 of U.S Patent No. 6,493,707, and claims 1-30 of U.S. Patent No. 6,490,580. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims 1, 3-8, 11-14, 16-21, and 24-30 of the instant application define an obvious variation of the invention claimed in US Patent No. 6,996,775, US Patent No. 6,493,707 and US Patent No. 6,490,580.

4. Claims 1-10, 12-23 and 25-37 of the instant application is anticipated by patent claims 1-40 of U.S. Patent No. 6,996,775, claims 1-24 of U.S Patent No. 6,493,707, and claims 1-30 of U.S. Patent No. 6,490,580, and in that claims of these Patents contain all the limitations of claims 1-10, 12-23 and 25-37 of the instant application. Claims 1-10, 12-23 and 25-37 of the instant application therefore are not patently distinct from the earlier patent claims and as such are unpatentable for obvious-type double patenting.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-3, 5-10, 12-16, 18-23, 25-30 and 35-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art, Abecassis, US Patent No. 6,504,990, Barr, Barr et al. (Barr), US Patent No. 5,873,076 and further in view of Liddy et al. (Liddy), US Patent No. 5,963,940.

7. As to independent claims 1 and 14, Applicant(s) admitted that prior art discloses a method for finding documents which relate to a portion of a temporal document, comprising:

(a) in response to a signal of interest at a particular time during the temporal document, identifying a segment of the temporal document for which related documents are to be found (Applicant's Specification, page 3, paragraph [0011]: a user indicates interest during a particular segment (particular time) of the video material (temporal document); upon an expression of interest, the related web page or document of the particular segment may presented to the user);

(b) selecting text associated with the segment of the temporal document identified (Applicant's Specification, page 3, paragraph [0011]: the particular web page

previously chosen as related to this segment of the video material may be presented to the user);

(c) finding the related documents by use of information retrieval techniques as applied to the selected text (Applicant's Specification, page 3, paragraphs [0010]-[0011]: when the particular portion of the video is reached or chosen, the related web page or document may be presented to the user, or the user may be informed of the availability of a link to related material and offered the choice of accessing it);

Applicant admitted that the prior art discloses a user indicates interest at a particular segment of the video material by clicking with a mouse or pressing a button as shown in the Specification, page 3, paragraph [0011]. One of ordinary skill in the art would have acknowledged that the indicated video segment would include a time interval which is a beginning time and an end time of the indicated video segment. In addition, Examiner has introduced Abecassis reference, which teaches a user defines a video segment for playing, wherein the defining may be either directly by identifying a beginning and an ending point (time), or indirectly by identifying at least one of a plurality of video segments (Abstract).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Abecassis with Applicant's admitted prior art to include identifying a temporal range of the temporal document in order to create a user-friendly environment for user to play only chosen video segments.

However, Applicant's admitted prior art and Abecassis, do not teach wherein the related documents are selected from a collection of documents according to scores associated with the documents.

In the same field of endeavor, Barr et al. disclose a searching/retrieval system which can query a library or database and identify not only text documents, but also multi-media files stored on the library or database that are relevant to query (col. 2, line 59 – col. 3, line 54). Barr et al. also disclose accepting a query and returning a single search results list having both text and multi-media information (temporal document), and query server performs a relevance ranking on each of the textual documents and multi-media files identified by the search by generating a relevance score corresponding to each of the entries on the search result list, and this relevance is based on the term location information contained in index database, and in part on the relative proximity within the document file of terms forming the search query (col. 12, lines 54-65, col. 13, lines 30-67 and col. 24, lines 19-26).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Barr with Applicant's admitted prior art an Abecassis to include the related documents are selected from a collection of documents according to scores associated with the documents. Barr suggests that assigning scores associated with documents identified during a query search would indicate the degree to which the document relates to the subject.

However, Applicant's admitted prior art, Abecassis and Barr do not explicitly disclose said scores for each document based on a summation of term scores for at

least a subset of the terms of the selected text, the term score of a term is weighted to a temporal position of the term within the temporal range.

The specification of page 7, paragraph [0027] recites "The related documents may be selected from the collection according to the scores achieved when evaluating documents in collection according to a formula giving scores to documents depending upon the occurrence in the documents of terms which occur in text associated with the portion of the temporal document identified." Therefore, the limitation "the term score of a term is weighted to a temporal position of the term within the temporal range" is interpreted as "the term score of a term is weighted depending upon the occurrence in the documents of terms which occur in text associated with the portion of the temporal document identified."

Liddy discloses the scores are an indication of the strength of the association between the term and the document, and for each document the within document Term Frequency (TF) is calculated; the product of TF and the Inverse Document Frequency (IDF) is used as the basis for the postings score - a measure of the relative prominence of a term compared to its occurrence throughout the corpora, and TF.IDF scores are cataloged for a varying number of logical paragraphs in a given document (col. 16, lines 1-23). One of ordinary skill in the art would have acknowledged that the term score (term frequency) of a term proportional to an inverted document frequency of the term from the formula TF.IDF, and where TF is the numbers of occurrences of a term within a given document (col. 22, lines 12-25). Liddy further discloses that different sources of evidence are used to compute individual measures of scores between the query and a

given document and the individual scores are combined or summed to form a single relevance score (col. 22, line 1 - col. 23, line 50).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Liddy with Applicant's admitted prior art, Abecassis and Barr to include said scores for each document based on a summation of term scores for at least a subset of the terms of the selected text, the term score of a term is weighted to a temporal position of the term within the temporal range. Liddy suggests that the product of TF.IDF for a given term in a document provides a quantitative indication of a term's relative uniqueness and importance for matching purposes.

8. As to dependent claims 2 and 15, Applicant's admitted prior art discloses wherein the temporal document is video or audio material (Specification, page 3, paragraphs [0009-[0011]: temporal documents can be movies which include video and audio material).

9. As to dependent claims 3 and 16, Applicant's admitted prior art discloses wherein the video material is stored on a video server (Specification, page 3, paragraphs [0009-[0011]: temporal document is stored on a server).

10. As to dependent claims 5 and 18, Applicant's admitted prior art discloses wherein the selected text is the closed-captioned text associated with the temporal range of the

temporal document (Specification, page 2, paragraph [0006]: "static" displays of text and/or images, which is the equivalent of close-captioned text.)

11. As to dependent claims 6 and 19, Applicant's admitted prior art discloses the temporal document including text as discussed above regarding claims 5 and 18.

12. As to dependent claims 7 and 20, Applicant's admitted prior art and Abecassis disclose wherein the document text appearing to the user varies with time and the selected text is included within the temporal range of the temporal document (Applicant's Specification, page 3, paragraphs [0010]-[0011]: when the particular portion of the video is reached or chosen, the related web page or document may be presented to the user, or the user may be informed of the availability of a link to related material and offered the choice of accessing it).

Applicant admitted that the prior art discloses a user indicates interest at a particular segment of the video material by clicking with a mouse or pressing a button as shown in the Specification, page 3, paragraph [0011]. One of ordinary skill in the art would have acknowledged that the indicated video segment would include a time interval which is a beginning time and an end time of the indicated video segment. In addition, Examiner has introduced Abecassis reference, which teaches a user defines a video segment for playing, wherein the defining may be either directly by identifying a beginning and an ending point (time), or indirectly by identifying at least one of a plurality of video segments (Abstract).

13. As to dependent claims 8 and 21, Applicant's admitted prior art discloses wherein the document text includes news bulletins, weather, sports scores or stock transaction or pricing information (Specification, page 2, paragraph [0008]: the text of news bulletins, stock quotations, sports scores).

14. As to dependent claims 9 and 22, Applicant's admitted prior art discloses wherein the related documents are accessed through a network (Specification, page 2, paragraph [0006]: sites or pages accessed through the Web may consist "static" displays of text and/or images, which reside one or more host servers or network, and may be accessed through the Internet).

15. As to dependent claims 10 and 23, Applicant's admitted prior art discloses further including selecting the related documents from among a collection of documents which may be accessed through the network, by utilizing databases comprising information about the collection (Specification, page 2, paragraph [0006]: sites or pages accessed through the Web may consist "static" displays of text and/or images, which reside one or more host servers or network, and may be accessed through the Internet).

16. As to dependent claims 12 and 25, Applicant's admitted prior art discloses wherein evaluating documents in the collection includes accessing compressed document surrogates (Specification, page 3, paragraph [0011]: the user may be

informed of the availability of a link (instead of a page or site of web) to the related material).

17. As to dependent claims 13 and 26, Applicant's admitted prior art, however, does not explicitly disclose wherein related documents are selected from the collection by a server which is distinct from the server which receives the signal of interest.

Barr discloses in col. 8, line 50 – col. 9, line 22 that a data center includes session server 114 for receiving a search query from user and query server 116 for sending search results information, thus session server 114 and query server 116 are distinct from each other.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Barr with Applicant's admitted prior art to include separate servers, one for receiving the information, and the other for processing the information, and thus separate servers would enhance the system and be easier for maintenance.

18. As to dependent claims 35 and 36, Applicant's admitted prior art discloses wherein the temporal range is defined by the particular time of the signal of interest and a second time that is different from the particular time (Applicant admitted that the prior art discloses a user indicates interest at a particular segment of the video material by clicking with a mouse or pressing a button as shown in the Specification, page 3, paragraph [0011]. One of ordinary skill in the art would have acknowledged that the

indicated video segment would include a time interval which is a beginning time and an end time of the indicated video segment. In addition, Examiner has introduced Abecassis reference, which teaches a user defines a video segment for playing, wherein the defining may be either directly by identifying a beginning and an ending point (time), or indirectly by identifying at least one of a plurality of video segments (Abstract).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Abecassis with Applicant's admitted prior art to include identifying a temporal range of the temporal document in order to create a user-friendly environment for user to play only chosen video segments).

19. As to independent claim 37, Applicant's admitted prior art discloses a method, comprising:

(a) in response to a signal of interest at a particular time during a temporal document, identifying a portion of the temporal document for which related documents are to be found (Applicant's Specification, page 3, paragraph [0011]: a user indicates interest during a particular segment (particular time) of the video material (temporal document); upon an expression of interest, the related web page or document of the particular segment may presented to the user);

(b) basing the identification of the portion of the temporal document on the particular time and at least one point in time preceding the particular time (Applicant admitted that the prior art discloses a user indicates interest at a particular segment of the video

material by clicking with a mouse or pressing a button as shown in the Specification, page 3, paragraph [0011]. One of ordinary skill in the art would have acknowledged that the indicated video segment would include a time interval which is a beginning time and an ending time of the indicated video segment, and ending time is considered as the particular time and beginning time is considered as time preceding the particular time);

(c) selecting text associated with the portion of the temporal document (Applicant's Specification, page 3, paragraph [0011]: the particular web page previously chosen as related to this segment of the video material may be presented to the user);

(d) finding the related documents by use of information retrieval techniques as applied to the selected text (Applicant's Specification, page 3, paragraphs [0010]-[0011]: when the particular portion of the video is reached or chosen, the related web page or document may be presented to the user, or the user may be informed of the availability of a link to related material and offered the choice of accessing it);

As mentioned above, one of ordinary skill in the art would have acknowledged that the indicated video segment would include a time interval which is a beginning time and an ending time of the indicated video segment, and ending time is considered as the particular time and beginning time is considered as time preceding the particular time. To prove that, Examiner has introduced Abecassis reference, which teaches a user defines a video segment for playing, wherein the defining may be either directly by identifying a beginning and an ending point (time), or indirectly by identifying at least one of a plurality of video segments (Abstract).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Abecassis with Applicant's admitted prior art to include identifying a temporal range of the temporal document in order to create a user-friendly environment for user to play only chosen video segments.

20. Claims 4 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art, Abecassis, Barr and Liddy as discussed in claims 1-3, 5-10, 12-16, 18-23, 25-30 and 35-37 above, and further in view of Witteman, US Patent Number 6,243,676.

21. As to dependent claims 4 and 17, Applicant's admitted prior art, Abecassis, Barr and Liddy, however, do not explicitly disclose wherein the selected text is determined by application of speech recognition techniques to the audio component of the portion of the temporal document identified.

Witteman discloses when a word or phrase (text) has been identified, the word or phrase is sent to the speech recognizer to search recent audio feeds for that word or phrase (Abstract and col. 4, lines 49-61).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings Witteman with Applicant's admitted prior art, Abecassis, Barr and Liddy to include the selected text is determined by application of speech recognition techniques to the audio component of the portion of the temporal document identified. Witteman's system provides text feed which is searchable and

aligned with the audio feed so the user can search for the item of interest and can either read the text feed or listen to the audio feed.

22. Claims 27 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art, Abecassis, Barr and Liddy as discussed in claims 1-3, 5-10, 12-16, 18-23, 25-30 and 35-37 above, and further in view of Herz et al. (Herz), US Patent Number 5,835,087.

23. As to dependent claims 27 and 31, Applicant's admitted prior art, Abecassis, Barr and Liddy, however, do not explicitly disclose wherein the temporal range precedes the particular time of the signal of interest.

In the specification, page 11, paragraph [0039] recites "the interest of the user in the content of the temporal document may be expressed as a function W(t) of the time t prior to the signal indicating interest being given. In the same field of endeavor, Herz discloses computing weighted sum of selected normative at attributes of target object, retrieving summarized weighted relevance feedback data, and then computing topical interest of target object for selected user based on relevance feedback from all user (Figure 12 and col. 18, line 37 – col. 19, line 30).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Herz with Applicant's admitted prior art, Abecassis, Barr and Liddy to include he interest of the user in the content of the temporal document may be expressed as a function W(t) of the time t prior to the signal

indicating interest being given. Herz suggests that computing the weighted sum of the identified weighted selected attributes to determine the intrinsic quality measure

24. Claims 28 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art, Abecassis, Barr and Liddy as discussed in claims 1-3, 5-10, 12-16, 18-23, 25-30 and 35-37 above, and further in view of Wiegand et al. (Wiegand), US Patent Number 6,807,231.

25. As to dependent claims 28 and 32, Applicant's admitted prior art, Abecassis, Barr and Liddy, however, do not explicitly disclose each temporal position within the temporal range is weighted equally.

Wiegand discloses the weighted superposition, all segments or blocks of image document are considered equally (col. 5, line 58 - col. 6, line 34).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Wiegand with Applicant's admitted prior art, Abecassis, Barr and Liddy to include each temporal position within the temporal range is weighted equally for the purpose of easily predicting relative to current frame at time t sub n+1.

26. Claims 29-30 and 33-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art, Abecassis, Barr and Liddy as

discussed in claims 1-3, 5-10, 12-16, 18-23, 25-30 and 35-37 above, and further in view of Irie et al. (Irie), US Patent Number 5,525,808.

27. As to dependent claims 29 and 33, Applicant's admitted prior art, Abecassis, Barr and Liddy, however, do not explicitly disclose wherein the weight of each temporal position within the temporal range increases from a beginning point of the range to a second point of the range, is weighted equally from the second point of the range to a third point of the range, and decreases from the third point of the range to an end point of the range.

In the specification, applicant pointed out figures 2-5 for supporting this limitation. In the same field of endeavor, Irie discloses in Figure 8 that the weight of each position increases from the beginning point to the second point, is weighted equally to 1 from the second point to a third point, and decreases from the third point to an end point.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Irie with Applicant's admitted prior art, Abecassis, Barr and Liddy to include the weight of each temporal position within the temporal range increases from a beginning point of the range to a second point of the range, is weighted equally from the second point of the range to a third point of the range, and decreases from the third point of the range to an end point of the range for the purpose of easily predicting the next weight of each temporal position within the temporal range.

28. As to dependent claims 30 and 34, Irie discloses each temporal position within the temporal range is weighted according to a discrete two stage exponential function (col. 89, lines 9-22).

Response to Arguments

In the remarks, Applicant(s) argued in substance that

A) No claim of the '866 patent recites "identifying a temporal range" and weighting terms "according a temporal position of the term within the temporal range" is not an obvious variation of the subject matter claimed in the '866 patent.

In reply to argument A, Applicant's arguments related to double patenting rejection seem to be persuasive. Therefore, the double patenting rejection related to the '866 Patent is withdrawn. However, Examiner's made a new double patenting rejection, which relates to other patents. Please see the rejection above.

B) Applicant requests that section 101 rejections should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

In reply to argument B, since applicant has amended the independent claim 14 to include "a computer system having a storage medium", which presents statutory subject matter, therefore, section 101 rejection is withdrawn.

C) Applicant requests that section 112 rejections (First and Second paragraphs) should be withdrawn.

In reply to argument C, since applicant explains and points out in the Specification for supporting "temporal range", applicant's explanations seem persuasive. Therefore, the section 112 rejections are withdrawn.

D) The prior art does not disclose "identifying a temporal range".

In reply to argument D, the examiner has made a new rejection which include new prior arts (Applicant's admitted prior art and Abecassis) for teaching the limitation "identifying a temporal range". Please see the rejection above in claims 1 and 14.

E) The prior art does not disclose "the term score of a term is weighted according to a temporal position of the term within the temporal range".

In reply to argument E, the specification of page 7, paragraph [0027] recites "The related documents may be selected from the collection according to the scores achieved when evaluating documents in collection according to a formula giving scores to documents depending upon the occurrence in the documents of terms which occur in text associated with the portion of the temporal document identified." Also, as mentioned above in the rejections of claims 1 and 14, Applicant admitted that the prior art discloses a user indicates interest at a particular segment of the video material by clicking with a mouse or pressing a button as shown in the Specification, page 3, paragraph [0011]. One of ordinary skill in the art would have acknowledged that the indicated video segment would include a time interval which is a beginning time and an end time of the indicated video segment. In addition, Examiner has introduced

Abecassis reference, which teaches a user defines a video segment for playing, wherein the defining may be either directly by identifying a beginning and an ending point (time), or indirectly by identifying at least one of a plurality of video segments (Abstract). Therefore, the limitation "the term score of a term is weighted to a temporal position of the term within the temporal range" is interpreted as "the term score of a term is weighted depending upon the occurrence in the documents of terms which occur in text associated with the portion of the temporal document identified."

In this case, Liddy discloses the scores are an indication of the strength of the association between the term and the document, and for each document the within document Term Frequency (TF) is calculated; the product of TF and the Inverse Document Frequency (IDF) is used as the basis for the postings score - a measure of the relative prominence of a term compared to its occurrence throughout the corpora, and TF.IDF scores are cataloged for a varying number of logical paragraphs in a given document (col. 16, lines 1-23). One of ordinary skill in the art would have acknowledged that the term score (term frequency) of a term proportional to an inverted document frequency of the term from the formula TF.IDF, and where TF is the numbers of occurrences of a term within a given document (col. 22, lines 12-25). Liddy further discloses that different sources of evidence are used to compute individual measures of scores between the query and a given document and the individual scores are combined or summed to form a single relevance score (col. 22, line 1 - col. 23, line 50).

F) Prior art does not disclose "basing the identification of the portion of the temporal document on the particular time and at least one point in time preceding the particular time" and " the term score of a term is weight according to an amount of time in which the term precedes the particular time".

In reply to argument F, Applicant's arguments with respect to newly amended limitations of claim 37 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Please see the rejection above.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chau Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-4092. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Doug Hutton, can be reached at (571) 272-4137.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306. On July 15, 2005, the Central Facsimile (FAX) Number will change from 703-872-9306 to 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Chau Nguyen
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2176

/Rachna S Desai/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2176